

The Committee of Inquiry met at 12 Noon Thursday, June 17, 1965. The purpose of the meeting was to hear Dr. Thomas McP. Brown's recollections of the events leading to the appointment of Dr. Elliott as President of The George Washington University. Mr. Reuben Wood, Mr. Wolfgang Kraus and Mr. J. Forrester Davison were present.

Dr. Brown recounted the following:

He had recently met Mrs. Graham (member of the Board of Trustees) in the corridor of the hospital. They talked a few moments and Mrs. Graham stated they had really tried to be fair to the Faculty but things had worked out badly. Said she had accepted a position on the Executive Committee for next year. She also said she hoped to have an opportunity to talk with Mr. J. A. Brown very soon - hopefully next week. (Presumably this conversation refers to Mrs. Graham's position on the Washington Post newspaper whose editorials had been unflattering to the work of the Faculty Committee). Dr. Brown said he pointed out that the tragedy of the whole chain of events had been that the Board had had an opportunity to work with one group who could really have helped the University and instead the bad publicity in the newspapers had placed the group in a very bad light.

Q. To what extent do you think she realized, whatever her personal views were, or may be now, that the view in the mind of cynical people may be that there is a potent, powerful clique at the University?

A. I don't know but I don't trust her. We thought Mr. Ellison was a nice little fellow at first and he was planning to become unilateral all along. He told us in no uncertain terms that our Committee might be helpful but it should be clearly understood that his Committee would make the final decision. We were in existence only to advise and consult. We pointed out that we could supply the Board with much information which they were not in a position to get. He said this again later as I recall when the Board was preparing to go off unilaterally on J. Perkins. He was pushing J. Perkins whom they liked. We pointed out his faculty relations at Delaware were not good. Finally, Ellison pulled back. He said he was willing to let him go if we felt this way about it. He withdrew to make us feel he was making a concession to us. We pointed out J. Perkins was overbearing and we had found out he was rejected at

Q. Did anyone say he had been in the running in President Carroll's time?

A. Ellison said he turned it down himself because he had come to Delaware so recently. He had been a number one candidate in the beginning (this time) and our committee got the information on him and it was horrible. As the Chairman, I investigated him and told Ellison. He was surprised, but he always circled back and said he was a fine man.

Q. Was there any talk about Acting Presidents?

A. In consultation with Ellison, I asked him not to put in someone like Elmer Kayser. When I went to see him (Ellison) I asked him if he minded if I taped some of his remarks so that we could think about them later. We talked about President Colclough's health and Mr. Ellison stated that since it was not too good, we were left with someone like Kayser. He said he might be good. I said the Committee wanted to know about the Acting President. The Committee is not about to approve of Kayser. This was all in private. Mr. Ellison said of course they would consult with us before putting in an Acting President. No appointment would be made of an Acting President without our consultation.

Later I met him in my office in the hospital with the whole committee. I said I wanted to have it clear on the record that our last memorandum to the Faculty Assembly had been sent to him. How did he react to this memorandum? He replied it was fine except for the last part about the Acting President. He asked if I had the machine turned on then. I told him I did not and he said then he never said that. I said my word was good and this was the first time I ever heard it contested and I resented it. He then said that he wanted to tell us all that as far as he was concerned, he would certainly consult with us about the Acting President. He is like that. Likes to knock you down to size so you won't be too forward. He blasted Stevens a few times. Likes the strong arm business.

He did compliment the Committee on the data we came back with on Perkins. Said it was excellent in fact. Fine detail.

Q. Did you ever have any discussion about criteria?

A. Only at the beginning. I don't remember anything but an impression here. It was customary to go over what we expressed in the memoranda. He said they were all right. His Committee never did anything official about it, nor did we demand anything. He seemed to find them only mildly interesting. One thing he said was that we had to have a man who was academically distinguished and his wife had to be charming. Very important that the wife be attractive and interesting. There is much she can do at the University to help. I understand, however, that Elliott's wife hates crowds - is not really interested in University affairs.

Q. We are interested in exploring the good faith of the Board Committee. Were they dealing in good faith? What about the letter reported to have been sent to the trustees by Ellison asking for unanimous support of Elliott. What is your impression about this letter?

A. I have the impression it was received before we had an opportunity to express our views to his Committee on Friday.

Q. Some information has come our way that it may have been sent on the 20th of May. What about that?

A. This would certainly be the key to the whole situation. This would certainly be a breach of faith in view of our visit to the campus and all. It would be a great embarrassment.

Q. What about the three resolutions of the Committee which were listed in your final report to the Assembly. We are not questioning about this as a challenge of these votes.

A. When we recommended against his (Elliott) selection, we did not state he was not qualified. The question was not about qualifications. It was about making an appointment at this time.

Note: There was some discussion here about how Dr. Elliott's qualifications fit the criteria but it was not clear to the Secretary.)

Q. Did you think a better qualified man could be found?

A. We could have found a better man to fit our guidelines.

Dr. Brown then read a copy of the notes he used in speaking to the entire Board at its meeting on June 5, 1965, a copy of which ~~are~~ attached to these minutes.)

(Dr. Brown then said some people had asked why the Committee did not keep written records of its discussions. He stated that the Secretary (Mr. Arthur Miller) felt a written record was unnecessary) I checked all the facts in the above mentioned report myself. The Board listened intently. It was a fait accompli at that time I think. The report pointed out all the facts. (Bill Schmidt strung it out. Some people said later if he had not come, it would have been a stronger case.) There was spontaneous applause afterward. The Board itself was not happy about the way this thing was done. It was done by a handful of people, but all had accepted it.

Q. There was quite a time lag between the time you were invited to the meeting and the time you actually went there. Do you think the Board had already recorded its vote by the time you arrived?

A. We were supposed to be there at 2:30 but we did not get in until after 3 p.m.

Dr. Brown then reviewed what happened on the last few days:

We met on Thursday and made our decision.

We met on Friday morning, double-checked on our feelings, then met with their Committee. We read our resolutions. Ellison and the Committee listened, talked generally about it. It was clear-cut that their decision had been made. They said they would give us their final conclusions on Saturday. We left them at 11:30 or 11:45 and sat around talking. Before I left the meeting, I asked Mr. Ellison if I could have a hearing before the full Board. He said, "We have no outsiders". Mr. Hughes was standing there. He came down later as emissary to say we could send anyone we chose - all of us if we wished - and President Colclough said we could not be included until after 3 pm.

(There was discussion here about the Board luncheon at which Mr. Kraus and Mr. Brown were talking and Mr. Brown said he had not been informed about what had been decided but there were several casual mentions of "the new administration." It was remarkable, Mr. Kraus said, to see the "huddling in corners" while lunch was going on. Mention was also made here to the fact that Mr. E. K. Morris had attended the last two conferences of the Committee.)

Q. Mr. Miller stated dogmatically that the report on Elliott from the campus was unconvincing one way or another. What is your opinion on that?

A. John Kaye who rarely said anything, (but you can check with him) said he was quite pleased with the way I had handled the matter. Miller said it was not a convincing story but we had turned him down. Ericson "stuck" on method. Professor St. Cyr never really made up her mind but thought he (Elliott) was wrong.

Q. There is a question about the Committee's objectivity especially with regard to John A. Brown. Would you comment on that?

A. My feeling was that he became a permanent candidate. There was no one better. Up to that point objectivity was fine. We always mentioned John A. Brown on our lists. He was never on theirs. Elliott never was there either. If we could have produced someone like Courtland Perkins, John A. Brown would have been put in second place.

Q. Do you think the Deans and Chairman's meeting was unfair and undercut the actions of your Committee?

A. I identified myself as Chairman of the Department of Medicine at this meeting and I had to state that John A. Brown met the criteria we had set up. (Later his own Committee gave him a vote of confidence.)

Q. Apart from your attendance, did you think there might be others who thought this group were procedurally undercutting the Committee?

A. Miller said they had a right to make a statement but it should have come through our Committee. He said people would not understand why it had not.Later the deans finally put another one through our Committee and Mr. Miller condemned that.

Q. How would it have looked if you had not signed it.

A. That showed my stand in the matter. I wanted the best man. If I had it to do over, maybe I would not have done it. I think I should perhaps not have signed. Dean Parks said if you do not sign it, I will not sign it.

Q. To what extent was your Committee aware that the Trustees were against John Brown?

A. No reply at this time - another question was asked.

Q. What is your impression of what prompted Linton to hold this meeting at the time? What was the great sense of urgency?

A. As I got it from him, he heard John Brown was going to leave. He heard he had an offer. After signing this, I went to see Mr. Ellison with them as a Chairman of a department. Mr. Burns, Mr. Cole and Mr. Linton went to the meeting. It was a simple expression of the need for this man as the appropriate candidate.

Then I went to see John A. Brown to see if he was going to resign. He said he had declined the offer. He said he had done so before we went to see Ellison.

I approached Mr. Ellison on various occasions (you may check this with other members). I said our question is your attitude on Brown. I have the feeling you don't like him and don't want him. He has the qualifications. What is the matter with him? He said he talks too much and I said give me an example. He said the Ratchet got him to express views that they (the students) needed better facilities and that he would help to get them. It was embarrassing when there is no money. I said Mr. Ellison, I do not understand that kind of thinking. Recognition of the need is what we do need. He said as his second argument that Brown started a campaign for his own benefit. Mr. Brown said he should produce evidence or he would resign. I spoke to Ellison. When everyone wants him, it is beyond a campaign. All these people who want him are responsible people. Another time Mr. Ellison said that Mr. Brown came as a fund-raiser and he is put in suddenly as Dean of Faculties (check this with other Committee members) Assumption is he forced them to do this.

(Here Mr. Kraus explained how Mr. Brown became Dean of Faculties)

Q. Your report to the Faculty Assembly was not seen by the Committee before you gave it. Why was this?

A. They gave me a free hand to say what I wanted to say. I went back and talked to the group after I made the statement. Everyone said it was very good.

Q. Do you think the Board of Trustees felt that they would just do this and that is it?

A. All I can say is Ellison's statement that it is their decision. I do not think a thing has been accomplished. The Board Attitude has not changed toward the Faculty.

(Some discussion of Mr. J. A. Brown ensued here. Should he be encouraged to stay? We would be lost without him in the Medical School. How can he be induced to stay with dignity after all this pummelling? Mrs. Graham said "We do not want to lose him.")

Q. How much time did you put in on this Committee?

A. We met every week between September and Christmas. After December there was a lull. I feel I have lost a year. I spent so much time in meetings. Then the amount of thought that went into it. I was with it every minute. Then to have the thing blow up at the last minute! It was a complete waste of everyone's time. I felt our Committee had done much more than the Board Committee.

Q. Do you think there would be any advantage in submitting this matter to a T-Committee of the AAUP?

A. It is extremely important that we keep on this whole matter. We must keep lines open to the Board of Trustees. There is a terrible lack of communication. The Board Committee did no homework. I believe in Boards and I do not believe that faculty members should be members of the Board. (Here Dr. Brown spoke of a Board of Visitors, but the Secretary did not get this remark). My strongest recommendation would be that this could all have been avoided by decent communications. Mr. Ellison is a good person in destroying the whole thing. I think you can talk to Morris. I wonder why Elliott should not have asked how the faculty felt about him. Ransom wanted to know.

(Dr. Brown thinks we should point out to Morris and Phillips what we (the present Committee) think is wrong.)

Q. What do you think of some Faculty-Board liaison through the Senate? How do you feel about this?

A. I think we should keep coming at it until it is an established fact.

(There was a discussion here of how Faculty-Board relations are handled at Swarthmore College)

In great organizations there is respect for every man on the totem pole. Their opinions should be recognized before coming to conclusions.

(Dr. Brown then explained about having spoken to President Colclough about writing to Perkins, Brown, Ransom and Elliott etc. We sent these out. Dean Parks sent a letter to President Elliott saying we were looking forward to his arrival to help us with our new arrangements etc.)

(The meeting adjourned with a general discussion about what might possibly be done to apologize to Mr. Brown for all that had happened. How can the University make up to him for all of the publicity he received in this matter. Could he be named Provost of the University, could he be made Acting President until the new President can come down etc.)

The meeting adjourned at 4 pm.

Mr. Ellison and Members of the Board: -

On September 24th 1964, a communication from our Committee was sent to the Board of Trustees through Mr. Ellison, regarding the criteria which we considered essential in the selection process.

In our communication it was stated - "The candidate should have these characteristics. They are listed ^{These criteria will be mentioned in a moment} not necessarily in the order of importance". We have been proceeding with the assurance from Mr. Ellison and the ^{University} Assembly that these criteria were acceptable in providing proper guide lines in the selection process.

In regard to ^{Pres.} Mr. Lloyd B. Elliot only one ^{and possibly} two of the six criteria have been met and for this reason alone ~~that~~ ^{he} has been rejected by our Committee as an unacceptable candidate for the presidency of the George

1.
Mr. Ellison and Members of the Board: -

On September 24th 1964, a communication from our Committee was sent to the Board of Trustees through Mr. Ellison, regarding the criteria which we considered essential in the selection process. In our communication it was stated - "The candidate should have these characteristics. They are listed ^{These criteria will be mentioned in a} not necessarily in the order of importance" ^{moment.} We have been proceeding with the assurance from Mr. Ellison and the ^{University} Assembly that these criteria were acceptable in providing proper guide lines in the selection process.

In regard to ^{Pres.} Mr. Lloyd ~~W.~~ Elliot only one ^{and possibly} two of the six criteria have been met and for this reason alone ~~that~~ ^{he} has been rejected by our Committee as an unacceptable candidate for the presidency of the George

Washington University. In fact it is fair to say that ^{the qualification of} others who have been rejected in our attempt to provide both the Board and the Faculty with the best possible candidates, ~~we~~ have excluded ^{those of} the candidate under discussion, ~~in~~ ~~qualifications~~. The present situation leads us quite naturally to the admonition quoted by one of your own distinguished Board Members, who reminded us that the real danger period ~~was~~ ^{is} about now, when there was a tendency to take almost anyone, just to conclude this exhausting procedure.

I would remind you of the criteria selected as essential last September -

- (a) An understanding of the nature and function of a large metropolitan University
- (b) Administrative ability; he should recognize the need for delegation and the need for open avenues of communication throughout the University.

- (c) The positive probability of being able to develop substantial sources of funds for general university purposes;
- (d) A quality of academic leadership, ^{which} commands respect in the community of higher education and which attracts outstanding teachers & scholars.
- (e) An ability to communicate with members of all levels of American Society
- (f) A desire for excellence and a determination to be satisfied with nothing short of that goal.

(2) In regard to the Large Metropolitan University orientation
the candidates ~~orientation and~~ background does not
fit. ^{Teachers college} ^{beginning} a ~~normal school~~ background, and a degree
^{in the field of} Education, with experience limited to small
communities such as Ithaca & Orono is not
desirable for us. ^{Here a plan based on real experience for} ~~rather~~ strong future development
is needed in graduate institutes, ~~development~~
in grad of scholars & research ~~activities~~ ^{the very important} activities with
far in excess of liberal arts & sciences & objections.
This concern was reinforced at the time of our
University of Maine Campus visit when we
found grad faculty ~~would be~~ discontent because
of a particularly bad appointment in the
Dean of Graduate Studies. This had badly
hampered growth in the graduate direction for
five years, and the ^{president} ~~Committee~~ showed no
willingness ^{for inclusion} to correct this situation. It
seemed clear that this ^{various} difficulty could
have been avoided by anyone with
prior experience in this direction. Dr. Elliot

Spots will be made available for them in the fall through natural attrition by the drop-outs." "We don't think like this and asks about them later." "We don't have the faculty to handle it." "The Continuing Education program is the same thing. Teachers are supposed to leave the campus for this even with our shortage." "Where is there time for development of scholars & ^{to} promoting research under this system."

(c) The development of numerous funds. Foundation Funds as we all know are based on a University quality and objectives of a type not demonstrated in ~~the~~ any of his planning to date. We do not have a State Legislature here where a strong public Relations type individual would be ideal. This approach does not impress Foundation Leadership.

(d) Academic Leadership. The attraction of scholars as well as teachers. His program has failed to ~~accomplish~~ promote this objective.

6.

Teachers with scholarly intent are going elsewhere. "There is no atmosphere here to either develop or attract real scholars," as one Professor put it. "The most encouragement we have given has been to say that extra time must be found in addition to regular hours for those who want to do research."

Here at George Washington University the key^{to} moving ahead is to leave this attitude far behind, ^{and} not to move into ~~the~~ the very direction ^{from which} we must escape from.

(2) Ability to communicate with all levels of society. the answer would be affirmative.

"He is no orator." "Speaks best informally."

(4) A desire for excellence and a determination to achieve this goal. The problem here is not so much the question of desire as it is an understanding of the meaning of excellence. To train excellence in the number school teachers you can turn out for the

State of Maine, the number, of nurses, the ~~number~~
number of foresters, the number scientific farmers,
and technologists, and the number of home
economists. It is education of sorts for one and
all.

In a great National University the objective
should be quality at all costs as well as
quantity through the limitations of quality.
We should have a leader trained from the
ground up in this objective. We must go "up"
as well as "out." The framework for the
development of real quality thinking, so much
in our future is not in her program nor
has there been any evidence of this in the
interim 7 years Prudent Elliot has been
at the University of Maine. In fact with
the differential between work load and
available teachers becoming greater the final
achievement of the objective we seek would
grow even smaller.

For these reasons Mr. Chairman

We submit to the attention of the Board
the following resolutions -

① The Faculty Committee recommends against the appointment of Lloyd H. Elliott as President of the George Washington University.

Passed by vote of 7-0 with 3 abstentions.

② There is an urgent need for decisive leadership in the University. If a change is made in the Acting Presidency, we recommend John Anthony Brown.

Passed 7-1 with 2 abstentions. (Negative vote on procedure rather than substance.)

② The Faculty Committee states that it has no candidate to recommend at this time, and recommends that the search be continued for a candidate the calibre of Courtland Perkins.

Passed 7-3.